



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,577	05/03/2001	Young-Hoon Park	YPL-0017	6816

7590 02/21/2003

Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin South Road
Bloomfield, CT 06002

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MOORE, KARLA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1763	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary

Application No.

09/848,577

Applicant(s)

PARK, YOUNG-HOON

Examiner

Karla Moore

Art Unit

1763

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-7, 14, 17-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,338,363 to Kawata et al.

3. Kawata et al. disclose a thin film deposition reactor in Figure 10, comprising: a reactor block (201) on which a wafer is placed; a showerhead plate (17) for uniformly maintaining a predetermined pressure by covering the reactor block; a wafer block (5) installed in the reactor block, on which the wafer is to be seated; an exhausting portion (20) connected to the reactor block for exhausting a gas from the reactor block; a first connection line (19a, 19b) in communication with the shower head plate, through which a first reaction gas and/or inert gas flows; a second connection line (28) in communication with the showerhead plate, through which a second reaction and/or inert gas flows; and a diffusion plate (11) mounted on a lower surface of the showerhead plate, the diffusion plate having a plurality of spray holes (12) which are in communication with the first connection line and face the upper face of the wafer to spray the first reaction gas and/or inert gas onto the wafer, and a plurality of nozzles (Figure 5, 25-upper surface and narrow portion leading to reaction space 4) which are in communication with the second connection line and extend toward the inner surface side of the reactor block to spray the second reaction gas and/or inert gas toward the edges of the wafer.

Art Unit: 1763

4. With respect to claims 3, 18 and 20, although not illustrated, Kawata et al. teach the diffusion plate having a lower surface of convex form (column 6, rows 32-38).

5. With respect to claim 4, the diffusion plate further comprises a first diffusion plate (11a) in communication with the plurality of spray holes and the first connection line and a second diffusion plate (11b) in communication with the plurality of nozzles and the second connection line (see Figure 5).

6. With respect to claim 5, the reactor further comprises a first mixing portion (inside of 17) at a center of the inside of the diffusion plate for mixing the first reaction gas and diffusing the mixture to the spray holes.

7. With respect to claim 6, the reactor further comprises a second mixing portion (Figure 5, not numbered—square chamber like portion between 25 and 27) between the second connection line and the showerhead plate (laterally), the second mixing portion having an auxiliary diffusion plate (26) in which holes (27 and/or 46) are formed.

8. With respect to claim 7, the area of the diffusion plate on which the spray holes are formed is larger than the wafer (Figure 10).

9. With respect to claims 14 and 17, the reactor further comprises a pumping baffle (13) which is installed on the outer circumference of the wafer block, the pumping baffle comprising a sidewall (above baffle and towards the center of the reactor) placed around the lateral side of the wafer block, a bottom wall (below baffle and towards exterior of baffle) extended outward from a lower end of the sidewall, and holes (for heater 8 and leading to exhaust 20) formed in the bottom wall. Both the heater holes and exhaust holes are formed on each side of the reactor and are therefore symmetrical.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawata et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-7, 14, 17-18 and 20 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,439,524 to Cain et al.
12. Kawata et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.
13. However, Kawata et al. fail to teach a diffusion plate with at lower surface of a concave form.
14. Cain et al. teach a diffusion plate with a concave form (Figure 2) for the purpose of significantly improved uniformity of processing (column 3, rows 48-57 and column 4, rows 40-46).
15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a diffusion plate with a concave form in Kawata et al. in order to provide improved uniformity of processing as taught by Cain et al.

16. Claims 8-9 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawata et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-7, 14, 17-18 and 20 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,976,261 to Moleshi et al.
17. Kawata et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.
18. However, Kawata et al. fail to specifically teach the diameter of the spray holes being 1 to 2.5 mm or the number of spray holes being 100-1000.
19. Moleshi et al. teach that in showerhead design the diameter and the number of spray holes can be varied to optimize flow control and uniformity (column 5, rows 34-36).
20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have varied the diameter and number of spray holes in Kawata et al. in order to optimize flow control and uniformity as taught by Moleshi et al.

21. Claims 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawata et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-7, 14, 17-18 and 20 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,425,812 to Tsutahara et al.
22. Kawata disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

Art Unit: 1763

23. However, Kawata et al. fail to teach a spray hole comprising a lower and upper end and the upper end has a diameter larger than that of the lower end and a step portion is formed between the upper and lower end.

24. Tsutahara et al. teach a spray hole configuration (Figure 15; column 9, rows 21-26) comprising a larger diameter upper portion and a smaller diameter lower portion formed in between for the purpose of maintaining a blowout flow from each hole at a constant rate and to supply thoroughly diffused gas to the surface of the water and to prevent drifting of the flow.

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a spray hole configuration in Kawata et al. comprising a larger diameter upper portion and a smaller diameter lower portion with a step portion formed in between in order to maintain blowout flow from each hole at a constant rate and to supply thoroughly diffused gas to the surface of the wafer and prevent drifting of the flow as taught by Tsutahara et al.

26. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawata et al. and Tsutahara et al. as applied to claims 10 and 15 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 09-316644 to Arai et al.

27. The prior art applied above discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

28. However, the prior art fails to teach a diffusion plate with a thickness of at least 5 mm.

29. Arai et al. teach the use of a diffusion plate with a thickness of at least 5 mm for the purpose of obtaining a thin film of good quality in a short time (solution of abstract).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a diffusion plate with a thickness of at least 5 mm in the prior art applied above in order to obtain a thin film of good quality in a short time as taught by Arai et al.

31. Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawata et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-7, 14, 17-18 and 20 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,076,207 to Washitani et al.

Art Unit: 1763

32. Kawata et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed.
33. However, Kawata et al. fail to teach a distance between the diffusion plate and wafer block of 20-50 mm.
34. Washitani et al. teach a distance between the diffusion plate and wafer block of 20-50 mm for the purpose of obtaining a satisfactory film forming speed and a high degree of surface uniformity (Washitani et al. specifically teach a distance of 8-25 mm; column 5, rows 13-15).
35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have allowed a distance of 20-50 mm between the diffusion plate and wafer block in order obtain a satisfactory film forming speed and a high degree of surface uniformity as taught by Washitani et al.

36. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawata et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-7, 14, 17-18 and 20 above and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 09-316644 to Arai et al.
37. The prior art applied above disclose the invention substantially as claimed.
38. However, Kawata et al. fail to teach a diffusion plate with a thickness of at least 5 mm.
39. Arai et al. teach the use of a diffusion plate with a thickness of at least 5 mm for the purpose of obtaining a thin film of good quality in a short time (solution of abstract).
40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a diffusion plate with a thickness of at least 5 mm in Kawata et al. in order to obtain a thin film of good quality in a short time as taught by Arai et al.

Response to Arguments

41. Applicant's arguments filed 12/16/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
42. Applicant argues that Kawata et al. fail to disclose a first connection line in communication with the showerhead plate through which a first reaction gas and/or reaction gas flows and a second connection line in communication the showerhead plate, through which a second reaction gas and/or inert

Art Unit: 1763

gas flows. Examiner disagrees. As cited in the previous office action and the office action above, Kawata et al. disclose a first connection line (19a, 19b) in communication with the showerhead plate through the reaction gas mixing chamber (17) and a second gas connection line (28) also in communication with the showerhead plate. Examiner also notes that in describing claim 1, Applicant states that the claim calls for the first and second connection lines which "independently supply the first and second reaction gases and/or inert gases into the reactor, and the first and second reaction gases and/or inert gases diffused on a wafer without being mixed with each other". Examiner fails to find this limitation in claim 1 or any of the dependent claims. Applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

43. Applicant also argues that Kawata et al. fail to disclose a plurality of nozzles extending toward the inner side surface of the reactor block to spray the second reaction gas and/or inert gas toward edges of the wafer. Kawata et al. do disclose a plurality of nozzles (column 9, rows 11-12). Additionally, the nozzles of Kawata et al. extend in a downward direction towards the wafer edges so that at least a portion of the second reaction gas and/or inert gas would be sprayed/diffused towards the edges of the wafer as there are no barriers to prevent such a phenomenon. Examiner also notes that the nozzles are formed identically to those disclosed in the Applicant's Figure 3, 8 and 9 (133) representing their invention.

44. All other arguments presented are based on secondary references failing to cure the supposed deficiencies in Kawata et al., which are discussed above. As noted in the rejections above, these secondary references were cited against the present application for other reasons.

Conclusion

45. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

Art Unit: 1763

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karla Moore whose telephone number is 703.305.3142. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on 703.308.1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703.872.9310 for regular communications and 703.872.9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.308.0661.

km

February 19, 2003

brg-ms
BENJAMIN L. UTECH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700